

**1. Call to Order**

**2. Approval of Meeting Minutes of June 5, 2006**

**3. Proposition 1B Transportation Bond Follow-up**

Alix Bockelman, MTC, reported on the overall schedule for the Infrastructure Bond, should Proposition 1B be approved by the voters. She noted that there will be three waves of involvement: 1) near-term – by mid-January 2007; 2) medium term – Spring 2007; and 3) longer term (January 2008 and beyond). She reviewed the aggressive schedule for the Corridor Mobility Program, a \$4.5 billion statewide competitive program for improving the state highways, which begins with the CTC approving program guidelines and is followed by regional project submittals on December 1<sup>st</sup>. A recommended list of projects for the region will be released for comment by December 20<sup>th</sup>. To meet the January 16<sup>th</sup> CTC deadline for regional submittals, MTC will hold a special commission meeting on Wednesday, January 10, 2007. CTC will make program recommendations by March 1, 2007.

In Spring 2007, MTC will be establishing priorities for the transit element of the bond. The bond includes about \$4 billion for transit, of which \$3.6 billion would be distributed by formula and \$1.3 billion would come to transit in the Bay Area, (about \$1 billion by formula through the revenue based to the operators and \$350 million that would come to MTC for priority-setting as the region's population-share). In addition, CTC will be looking at the Regional Transportation Improvement Program (RTIP), in terms of the CTCs programming actions for the RTIP. The RTIP is broader than the Corridor Mobility Program because it can include transit projects, local streets and road projects, and bike and pedestrian improvements. In addition, the bond sets aside \$250 million for the local ITS program, which Caltrans would be in charge of funding. MTC will be working with Caltrans closely on the priorities for this part of the program.

Following January 2008, there will be some areas of the bond that will require Trailer Bills such as Transit Security and the State and Local Partnership.

Bob McCleary, CCTA noted that over the next two years there will be about six different programming opportunities for the CTC according to John Barna, CTC.

Suzanne Smith, Partnership Board Chair, thanked Alix and her staff for their work on the Corridor Mobility Program.

Ms. Bockelman next reported on the Corridor Mobility guidelines. She noted that the CTC released their draft guidelines a few weeks ago on the Corridor Mobility Program. At the CTC meeting in October, staff expanded on what they saw as the three broad goals of the guidelines: 1) to ensure accountability with the focus on project delivery; 2) to ensure cost effectiveness; and 3) to ensure that investments made were continued, which would require an emphasis on operational strategies especially in the urban areas.

MTC and Caltrans District 4 is considered one region from the standpoint of submitting projects for this program. The Bay Area is competing with Northern California's share for the state, which is \$1.8 billion of the \$4.5 billion program. The guidelines establish soft targets, which are

related to population for the urban areas and deficient mileage on focus routes for other areas. In terms of project eligibility, projects must be on state highway systems or major access routes to state highway systems and the projects should reduce travel time, improve connectivity, or improve the operation or safety of the highway segment. The performance will be assessed using cost benefit analysis with travel time savings and annual safety benefits as factors in that cost benefit analysis.

MTC supports CTC's draft guidelines and has submitted a few comments for consideration for the final draft. Staff is seeking concurrence from the Partnership on these comments. MTC believes that the Corridor Mobility Program needs to focus on congestion relief. The section that lays out program intent as improved performance on the most highly congested corridor should be emphasized and that language should be strengthened. In terms of project eligibility, MTC recommends that CTC should focus on projects with full funding plans to ensure that projects are delivered and consistent with voter expectations rather than funding a phase of a project. CTC also needs to include more flexibility in the area of the funding plans. There is strict language that states CMIA funding cannot replace any funds that may have been committed to the project. In regards to the Corridor System Management Plans, there was a language requirement stating that any capacity increasing project in the urban areas must be complemented by the corridor system management plans and MTC staff felt there needed to be more flexibility in how it is carried out.

Bob McCleary, CCTA, stated that due to a recent conversation with John Barna, the revised guidelines that come out today should incorporate much of the comments reviewed by Ms. Bockelman. Bob noted that the guidelines may not be the final version but may move in the direction that recognizes much of the comments made. There will be a meeting at Caltrans next Tuesday to discuss the draft guidelines before it is finalized.

Jose Luis Moscovich, SFCTA, stated that the performance improvement is what should be emphasized not congestion relief.

Carolyn Gonot, VTA, stated concern because VTA has areas that need to address connectivity and safety issues, not necessarily congestion.

Dennis Fay, ACCMA, stated that MTC's comments on the guidelines are reasonable, and recommended that the Partnership support them as amended by MTC's Legislation Committee.

#### **4. Coordinated Public Transit Human Services Plan**

Therese Knudsen, MTC, reported on the low-income component of the Coordinated Public Transit-Human Services Transportation Plan. There are three funding programs within SAFETEA that are tied to the Coordinated Plan. 1) Job Access Reverse Commute (JARC) program which focuses on the transportation needs of low income populations, 2) a new program called the New Freedom program, which focuses on transportation of the disabled community, and 3) Section 5310 program, a federal formula program focusing on elderly and disabled transportation needs. Starting in FY 2007 any projects funded through the three programs need to be derived from the Coordinated Plan. The purpose of the plan is to assess the needs of the three populations and come up with coordinated strategies to address them. In terms of the elderly and

disabled component, a consultant has been hired to help with the in-depth planning and anticipates having a draft of this component ready in Spring 2007. Some suggestions made by the communities were better lighting at bus stops, shuttles for children for school, and more sidewalks.

The low-income component of the plan is going to the Commission in November. MTC staff has already reviewed the plan with MTC's Minority Advisory Committee as well as the Regional Welfare to Work Transportation Working Group. The elderly and disabled component will be finished up in Spring and the coordination piece in May 2007.

Rick Ramacier, CCCTA, would like to see MTC bring the recipients of transportation related dollars from other federal departments into the discussion to enhance coordination. He also warned not to raise the public's expectations; it is not possible to reach all of them.

### **5. Update on MTC Environmental Justice Principles**

James Corless, MTC, gave an update/status report on the implementation of the Environmental Justice (EJ) principles. The MTC Commission adopted the first two EJ Principles in March 2006 and asked staff to look into the issues raised by EJ Principle Two. A joint subcommittee has been convened between MCAC, Partnership Board, and MTC staff. MTC provided the Commission an interim update in July 2006.

Principle #2 is about understanding and defining the presence and extent of inequities, if any, in transportation funding based on race and income.

Principle #3, which has not yet been adopted, would change discretionary investment decisions and actions to mitigate the identified inequities in Principle #2. In order to understand Principle #3, the Commission directed staff to examine any inequities that may exist and what implications it may have in terms of mitigation.

Mr. Corless described the various ways to look at equity; funding inputs, service outputs, and mobility and accessibility. The different ways to look at issues of equity and environmental justice are by communities of concern, funding by transit dependent households, and funding among transit operators by ridership.

The subcommittee is meeting on October 20<sup>th</sup> and November 17<sup>th</sup> and hopes to present Principle #2 to the Legislation Committee on December 8<sup>th</sup>.

Suzanne Smith, SCTA, commended the subcommittee for their work. She also emphasized that the focus for the Partnership is Principle #2.

Dorothy Dugger, BART, recognized that both elements of ridership contribute to the cost burden. Passenger miles have an implication for the cost burden.

Suzanne Smith stated that the Partnership meets after the Legislation Committee in December. The item that will be taken to the Commission is focused on principles #1 and #2, the data

collected and what that data may or may not reflect. Ms. Smith asked if the Partnership will have another opportunity to influence or comment on the staff recommendations before the Legislation Committee meeting in December.

Bob McCleary, CCTA, recommended that Principles #1 and 2 should be sufficient and appreciated the analysis performed to date. It should influence the next RTP discussions, and might also suggest that there is too much money going into transit. He noted that the information developed is very valuable to the commission and others going forward. He also noted that part of the solution is to try and identify sources of funding for the core rehab needs of the system and for expanding services beyond what we can afford now to community of concern and others.

Steve Heminger, MTC, suggested that a way to influence and debate over the principles is join the subcommittee. He also suggested submitting the principles to the Commission in January rather than December to allow the Partnership to respond to the subcommittee changes/comments.

Suzanne Smith stated that she would prefer to have the joint committee, MCAC, and the Partnership have an opportunity to work through the next two meetings and develop a final recommendation that could come to the Partnership and then have further discussion.

Frank Gallow, a member of MCAC and the Joint Committee, thanked the members. He addressed a concern that a fact was not voiced earlier. He stated that there was a consensus from all the subcommittee members that inequities did exist. He also stated that the time period analyzed was limited to a nine-year period only and may limit the results.

Lila Hussain, Urban Habitat, thanked the subcommittee members and recommends that the Partnership look beyond mobility and look at actual funding investments. She urged that the Partnership move forward and believes that the December 8<sup>th</sup> date should remain. Although data will not be perfect, Ms. Hussain believes there are significant findings. A comment letter was e-mailed to the Partnership and MCAC members before the meeting, which maintains that clear inequities. In regards to Principle four, she believes it should be adopted in review with the 2001 RTP which is close to Principle four that clearly states in the environmental section that the project level impacts are addressed and mitigated prior to MTC approval of state and federal funding.

Aaron Golub, Urban Habitat and a researcher at UC Berkeley's Transportation Center, commends staff for their effort and has never seen another MPO contribute so much energy into the kind of analysis versus typical mobility studies.

Mr. Golub continued to state that the fewer years available for highway and road maintenance the more skewed the numbers are and lack of finance that is given. It is encouraged to have the minimum of 20 years for analysis, but instead only received eight years due to the lack of data availability.

Ms. Smith recognized that in order to name reliable and consistent data, it is necessary to collect surveys and solid financial data that is maintained over significant periods of time.

The EJ item would be brought back to the Partnership in December for further discussion.

**6. Other**

Ms. Smith recognized Kate Miller, MTC, and her hard work in the Programming and Allocations section at MTC in the transit side. Ms. Miller is leaving MTC and going to AC Transit.

**7. Adjourn for Lunch/Next Meeting**